



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/753,660	01/09/2004	Arnold Gregory Klein		7206

30996 7590 12/12/2006

ROBERT W. BECKER & ASSOCIATES  
707 HIGHWAY 333  
SUITE B  
TIJERAS, NM 87059-7507

EXAMINER

ROWAN, KURT C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3643

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/753,660

Applicant(s)

KLEIN, ARNOLD GREGORY

Examiner

Kurt Rowan

Art Unit

3643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Sept. 21, 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: "friction fitting" the coated media "elastically" on the support.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 19 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. It appears that the limitations of claim 19 have been incorporated into claim 1 and therefore claim 19 does not further limit claim 1 and should be canceled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Erickson for substantially the same reasons stated in the last Office Action.

For the record, applicant has stated that the "means for" clause in claim 1 is intended to invoke 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph. Also, applicant has called for a friction fit between

Art Unit: 3643

the coated media and support. The specification recites an interference fit. For the purposes of this Office Action, the terms friction fit and interference fit are taken to mean the same. The patent to Erickson shows in Fig. 4 a disposable coated media such as ring 20 coated on at least one surface with a non-drying adhesive layer as disclosed in lines 59-65 of page 1. In reference to claims 1 and 5, the aperture or cutout hole in the ring 20 acts as a means to position and secure the insect barrier device on a support in an interference fit or a frictional fit that restricts any alternative crawling routes. Now, can the coated media of Erickson be considered to frictionally fit on the support. Since all of the elements in Erickson such as the support and coated media are in contact, they can be considered to be frictionally fitting. The flexible gasket 19 of Erickson which is made from rubber or felt can be considered to be elastic (especially when made from rubber) and the coated media is therefore elastically fitted on the support which is leg 10. The patent to Erickson can be considered to read on the present claims even invoking 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph since the present specification discloses on page 10, lines 16-21 that "there are any number of other common means, including clips, resilient bands, frictional contact or groove interference of a cutout hole that may be used to mount and hold insect deterring media in these devices". So these are equivalent means which do not differentiate over Erickson. The interference fit recited in the specification is not supported with any further discussion that would differentiate over Erickson. Hence while Erickson relates to trapping insects, a barrier is inherently formed by the adhesive which prevents insects from passing. In reference to claim 2,

Art Unit: 3643

Erickson discloses paper in line 62. In reference to claim 18, it appears that the ring 20 of Erickson has a uniform cross-section.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson.

5. The patent to Erickson shows a barrier having a flexible material as disclosed in column 4, lines 31-35, but does not disclose that the material is elastic. However, it would have been obvious to employ an old and well known elastic material to wrap around a tree so that the barrier can be compressed in size when not applied to a support. See in re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

6. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erickson as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Olson.

The patents to Erickson and Olson have been discussed above and in previous Office Action. Erickson does not disclose a protective coating layer of low adhesion paper. The patent to Olson discloses a layer 140. In reference to claim 3, it would have been obvious to provide Erickson with a layer of release paper as shown by Olson for the purpose of preventing the adhesive from sticking to non-target surfaces. In reference to claim 4, Olson shows a handling region 11, 13. It would have been obvious to provide

Art Unit: 3643

Erickson with a handling region as shown by Olson to keep the adhesive from contacting a user's hand.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 6-17 have been withdrawn from consideration. Applicant's response overcomes the examiner's objections to the use of PETE. Erickson shows that the disposable medium 20 has an integral mounting hole. Also, Erickson shows means to provide a friction fit the coated media 20 by the mounting hole on a support noting that the trap member 16 frictionally mounts on stem 11. Applicant has provided no structure to differentiate the contention that the Erickson device is a trap while the present invention is a barrier. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the insect barrier device is positioned between the nectar feeder and feeder support) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation of the nectar type bird feeder has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the

Art Unit: 3643

process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). The nectar feeder and the support for the feeder are not positively recited in the present claims. As stated previously, the prior art patent to Erickson shows structure that is capable of performing the intended use such as on a support for a nectar bird feeder. Hence Erickson teaches applicant's invention. Also, Erickson provides a continuous surface contact since the central hole 17 matches with the caster stem 11 to prevent the passage of insects. The trap of Erickson functions as insect barrier device since it prevents the passage of insects going from one place to another.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3643

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kurt Rowan whose telephone number is 571 272 6893. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Poon can be reached on 703 308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kurt Rowan  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3643

KR